

The Structure of a Real Linear Combination of Two Projections

Katsuyoshi Nishio

Department of Applied Mathematics

Faculty of Engineering

Ibaraki University

Hitachi, Ibaraki 316, Japan

ABSTRACT

A necessary and sufficient condition for a Hermitian operator on a Hilbert space to be expressed as $aP + bQ$ with some projections P, Q and reals a, b is established. Moreover the spectrum of such an operator is explicitly drawn in terms of the spectrum of $PQ|_{\text{ran } P}$, the restriction to the range of P .

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the structure of a real linear combination of two projections on a Hilbert space. Here a projection means a Hermitian idempotent operator.

Continuing the study in a previous paper [8] for the case of matrices, we shall give a necessary and sufficient condition for a Hermitian operator to be expressed as a linear combination of two projections. Such a condition seems to be lacking so far, except that Fillmore [5] obtained a condition for the representability as a sum of two projections, and Davis [2] obtained one as a difference of two projections.

Throughout the paper operators mean bound linear operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . The symbols $I, 0$ stand for the identity and null operator respectively, while P and Q denote projections with range \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} respectively. \mathcal{M}^\perp always denotes the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{M} , and $P^\perp = I - P$; accordingly $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$ ($= \text{ran } P \oplus \text{ran } P^\perp$), where \oplus denotes mutually orthogonal direct sum of two subspaces.

A Hermitian operator A is said to be positive (nonnegative) and denoted by $0 < A$ ($0 \leq A$) if $0 < \langle Ax, x \rangle$ ($0 \leq \langle Ax, x \rangle$) for any nonzero vector x , where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Order relations among Hermitian operators always refer to these notions, that is, $A < B$ means $B - A$ is positive, and so on.

2. PROJECTIONS IN GENERIC POSITION

The relation between two projections (equivalently, two subspaces) and relevant theories have been investigated by many authors (e.g., [2], [3], [6]).

The following identity has been well used:

$$(P^\perp - Q)^2 = I - (P - Q)^2, \quad (1)$$

while the identities listed below, which are used later, seem not to have been explicitly mentioned anywhere:

$$PQ - QP = QP^\perp - P^\perp Q = Q^\perp P - PQ^\perp = P^\perp Q^\perp - Q^\perp P^\perp, \quad (2)$$

$$P - Q = PQ^\perp - P^\perp Q, \quad (3)$$

$$PQ^\perp + QP^\perp = PQ^\perp P + P^\perp QP^\perp, \quad (4)$$

$$P(PQ - QP) = (PQ - QP)P^\perp \quad \text{and} \quad Q(PQ - QP) = (PQ - QP)Q^\perp. \quad (5)$$

The mutually orthogonal subspaces $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $\mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}$, and $\mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp$ are all reducing for both P and Q (hence also $aP + bQ$), and the restriction of $aP + bQ$ to each of these subspaces is a scalar. Therefore, in studying the structure of $aP + bQ$, the restrictions to these subspaces are of no interest. In this respect our concern will be only with the case in which

$$\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp = \mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp = \{0\}. \quad (6)$$

Following Halmos [6], let us say that projections P, Q are in *generic position* if their ranges $\mathcal{M} = \text{ran } P$ and $\mathcal{N} = \text{ran } Q$ satisfy (6). Dixmier [3] and Davis [2] used the term “position p .”

Halmos [6] gave a characterization of projections in generic position. We present here another characterization in the form useful to our aim.

LEMMA 1. *The following three conditions are mutually equivalent:*

- (a) P and Q are in generic position.
- (b) $PQ - QP$ is quasiinvertible (i.e., one to one and with dense range).
- (c) $0 < (P - Q)^2 < I$.

Proof. The equivalence (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) is derived immediately from the identity

$$\ker(PQ - QP) = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}) \oplus (\mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}) \oplus (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp) \oplus (\mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp), \quad (7)$$

because $[\text{ran}(PQ - QP)]^\perp = \ker(PQ - QP)$. To show the identity (7), it suffices to prove that the left hand side is contained in the right, because the reverse inclusion is clear. To this end let $x \in \ker(PQ - QP)$ and decompose x as $x = PQx + PQ^\perp x + P^\perp Qx + P^\perp Q^\perp x$. Then by (2), the equalities $PQx = QPx$, $PQ^\perp x = Q^\perp Px$, $P^\perp Qx = QP^\perp x$, and $P^\perp Q^\perp x = Q^\perp P^\perp x$ hold. These equalities lead to $PQx \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}$, $PQ^\perp x \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $P^\perp Qx \in \mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}$, and $P^\perp Q^\perp x \in \mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp$, from which (7) follows.

Also the equivalence (a) \Leftrightarrow (c) follows from the following identities together with (1):

$$\ker(P - Q) = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}) \oplus (\mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp), \quad (8)$$

$$\ker(P^\perp - Q) = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^\perp) \oplus (\mathcal{M}^\perp \cap \mathcal{N}). \quad (9)$$

These identities (8) and (9) are easily derived from (3) and its variant. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

The following well-known fact (see [4], [7]) will be used in the sequel.

LEMMA 2. *Let A_1 and A_2 be normal operators on Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 respectively. If there is a quasiinvertible operator T from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_2 satisfying $A_2 T = T A_1$, then A_1 and A_2 are unitarily equivalent.*

We shall write $A_1 \simeq A_2$ to denote that A_1 and A_2 are unitarily equivalent.

3. MAIN THEOREMS

THEOREM 1. *A Hermitian operator A can be expressed as $A = aP \div bQ$ with projections P, Q in generic position and nonzero real a, b if and only if for some real c the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $A - cI$ and $-(A - cI)$ are unitarily equivalent,
- (ii) either $0 < |A - cI| < |c|I$ or $|c|I < |A - cI|$ is valid.

Proof. Suppose that $A = aP + bQ$ with P, Q in generic position and nonzero real a, b . Then by Lemma 1 the operator $T = PQ - QP$ is quasiinvertible, and by (5)

$$\begin{aligned} \{A - \tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I\}T &= T\{aP^\perp + bQ^\perp - \tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I\} \\ &= T\{\tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I - A\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $A - \tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I$ and $\tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I - A$ are unitarily equivalent by Lemma 2, proving (i) with $c = \tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)$. To see (ii), let us first prove that

$$\tfrac{1}{4}(|a| - |b|)^2 I < \{A - \tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I\}^2 < \tfrac{1}{4}(|a| + |b|)^2 I. \quad (10)$$

In fact, direct computation shows that (10) is equivalent to

$$-\tfrac{1}{2}(|ab| - ab)I < ab(P - Q)^2 < \tfrac{1}{2}(|ab| + ab)I,$$

which is, in turn, equivalent to $0 < (P - Q)^2 < I$ when $ab \neq 0$. However, the inequalities in the last form are surely guaranteed by Lemma 1. Now (ii) follows immediately from (10), because $|c| = \tfrac{1}{2}(|a| + |b|)$ or $= \tfrac{1}{2}||a| - |b||$ according as $ab > 0$ or < 0 .

Suppose conversely that A satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) for some c . Without loss of generality we may assume $c \geq 0$, by taking $-A$ in place of A if necessary. In terms of the positive part $(A - cI)_+ = \tfrac{1}{2}\{(A - cI) + |A - cI|\}$ and the negative part $(A - cI)_- = \tfrac{1}{2}\{-(A - cI) + |A - cI|\}$, condition (i) means that

$$(A - cI)_+ \simeq (A - cI)_-.$$

Let $\mathcal{X} = [\ker(A - cI)_+]^\perp$ and $B = (A - cI)_+|_{\mathcal{X}}$, the restriction to \mathcal{X} . Then it follows that

$$A - cI \simeq \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & -B \end{bmatrix}.$$

In terms of B , condition (ii) with $c \geq 0$ means that

$$0 < B < cI \quad \text{or} \quad cI < B. \quad (11)$$

It remains to prove that (11) implies the existence of projections P, Q in

generic position and nonzero real a, b such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & -B \end{bmatrix} = aP + bQ - cI.$$

First let us consider the case $cI < B$. Remark that B is invertible if $c > 0$. Take any real d such that $B < dI$, and define S_1 and S_2 by

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{c+d}(B + dcB^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad S_2 = \frac{1}{d-c}(-B + dcB^{-1}).$$

with the convention $cB^{-1} = 0$ for $c = 0$. It is readily seen that

$$(c+d)S_1 + (c-d)S_2 = 2B. \quad (12)$$

Further, $I - S_1^2$ and $I - S_2^2$ are positive, and

$$(c+d)(I - S_1^2)^{1/2} + (c-d)(I - S_2^2)^{1/2} = 0 \quad (13)$$

because

$$(c+d)^2(I - S_1^2) = \{I - (cB^{-1})^2\}(d^2 - B^2) = (d-c)^2(I - S_2^2).$$

Now define P and Q by

$$P = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} I + S_1 & (I - S_1^2)^{1/2} \\ (I - S_1^2)^{1/2} & I - S_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Q = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} I + S_2 & (I - S_2^2)^{1/2} \\ (I - S_2^2)^{1/2} & I - S_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and a and b by $a = c + d$ and $b = c - d$. Then P and Q are projections, and (12) and (13) show that

$$aP + bQ - cI = \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & -B \end{bmatrix}.$$

Further, P and Q are in generic position. In fact, since $c = \frac{1}{2}||a| - |b||$ and $d = \frac{1}{2}(|a| + |b|)$ by definition, our assumption $cI < B < dI$ yields (10), which is equivalent to $0 < (P - Q)^2 < I$ because $ab \neq 0$. Now by Lemma 1, P and Q are in generic position.

Finally let us consider the case $0 < B < cI$. Apply the preceding argument to the triple $(B, 0, c)$ instead of (B, c, d) . Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & -B \end{bmatrix} = cP - cQ = cP + cQ^\perp - cI$$

for some projections P, Q in generic position. Let $a = c$ and $b = c$. Clearly P and Q^\perp are in generic position. This completes the proof. ■

THEOREM 2. *Let P, Q be projections in generic position, and a, b nonzero real. Then $aP + bQ$ is unitarily equivalent to*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(a+b)I_{\mathcal{M}} + C^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}(a+b)I_{\mathcal{M}} - C^{1/2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \text{ran } P$ and $C = \frac{1}{4}(a-b)^2I_{\mathcal{M}} + abPQ|_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 1 we showed that

$$aP + bQ - \frac{1}{2}(a+b)I \simeq \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & -B \end{bmatrix}$$

for some positive operator B on a Hilbert space \mathcal{X} . Therefore

$$aP + bQ \simeq \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(a+b)I_{\mathcal{X}} + B & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}(a+b)I_{\mathcal{X}} - B \end{bmatrix}.$$

It remains to prove that $B \simeq C^{1/2}$. To this end, first note that the following identity is valid:

$$\begin{aligned} \{aP + bQ - \tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I\}^2 &= P\left\{\tfrac{1}{4}(a+b)^2I - abQ^\perp\right\}P \\ &\quad + P^\perp\left\{\tfrac{1}{4}(a+b)^2I - abQ\right\}P^\perp. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In fact, direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \{aP + bQ - \tfrac{1}{2}(a+b)I\}^2 &= -(aP + bQ)(aP^\perp + bQ^\perp) + \tfrac{1}{4}(a+b)^2I \\ &= \tfrac{1}{4}(a+b)^2I - ab(PQ^\perp + QP^\perp), \end{aligned}$$

and (14) follows from (4). Consider again the operator $T = PQ - QP$ that maps $\mathcal{M} = \text{ran } P$ injectively to a dense set of $\mathcal{M}^\perp = \text{ran } P^\perp$. Since (5) yields

$$P \left\{ \frac{1}{4}(a+b)^2 I - abQ^\perp \right\} PT = TP^\perp \left\{ \frac{1}{4}(a+b)^2 I - abQ \right\} P^\perp, \quad (15)$$

we have by Lemma 2

$$P \left\{ \frac{1}{4}(a+b)^2 I - abQ^\perp \right\} P|_{\mathcal{M}} \simeq P^\perp \left\{ \frac{1}{4}(a+b)^2 I - abQ \right\} P^\perp|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}.$$

Since obviously

$$C = P \left\{ \frac{1}{4}(a+b)^2 I - abQ^\perp \right\} P|_{\mathcal{M}},$$

we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} B^2 & 0 \\ 0 & B^2 \end{bmatrix} \simeq \{ aP + bQ - \frac{1}{2}(a+b)I \}^2 \simeq \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the multiplicity theorem (see e.g., [1, Theorem 9.1 and Corollary 9.12]) results in $B^2 \simeq C$. Now it is easy to see that this is only possible when $B = C^{1/2}$. This completes the proof. ■

COROLLARY 3. *If P and Q are projections in generic position, then for any real a, b*

$$\sigma(aP + bQ) = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(a+b) \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(a-b)^2 + 4ab\mu} ; \mu \in \sigma(PQ|_{\text{ran } P}) \right\},$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the spectrum.

In fact, for nonzero a, b this follows immediately from Theorem 2, while the assertion is almost obvious if $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.

The author wishes to thank Professor T. Ando for a number of very useful suggestions.

REFERENCES

- 1 J. B. Conway, *Subnormal operators*, Pitman, Boston, 1981.
- 2 C. Davis, Separation of two linear subspaces, *Acta Sci. Math.* 19:172–187 (1958).

- 3 J. Dixmier, Position relative de deux variétés linéaires fermées dans un espace de Hilbert, *Rev. Sci.* 86:387–399 (1948).
- 4 R. G. Douglas, On the operator equation $S^*XT = X$ and related topics, *Acta Sci. Math.*, 30:19–32 (1969).
- 5 P. A. Fillmore, On sums of projections, *J. Funct. Anal.* 4:146–152 (1969).
- 6 P. R. Halmos, Two subspaces, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 144:381–389 (1969).
- 7 T. B. Hoover, Quasi-similarity of operators, *Illinois J. Math.* 16:678–686 (1972).
- 8 K. Nishio, Finite linear combinations of projections on a unitary space, *J. Fac. Engrg. Ibaraki Univ.* 31:49–53 (1983).

Received 3 December 1983; revised 27 April 1984